



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE TETRAGRAMMATON : ITS MEANING AND ORIGIN.

WHEN we turn from the circumstances of the Theophany in Exod. iii to the substance of the revelation, we pass from the natural to the political aspect of religion. He who thus addresses Moses is not merely a spirit of vegetation or of fire ; he is the God of a people which has already a history. But he is now (E) revealed by a new name, and this implies more than might at first sight be perceived. We shall fail to apprehend the religious ideas of antiquity if we assume that all its deities were regarded as so many independent beings, having each a distinct individual existence. A god is primarily a conception of the mind, the object of a certain mode of worship, and invoked by a name which defines, if it does not constitute, the person or character of the deity and his relation to his worshippers. Such conceptions are not of necessity mutually exclusive ; they fluctuate, they overlap, they admit of combination and confusion, of syncretism in ritual and speculation in mythology. Hence the necessity of defining by name the God who is to lead his people forth from Egypt, and of asserting his identity with the gods of patriarchal times. He is, like them, a tree-spirit, but he is infinitely more.

The significance of the name thus revealed is a problem which has exercised the ingenuity and the learning of generations of scholars. If these have not yet yielded any very satisfactory or convincing result, there is a presumption that the search has been wrongly directed, the clue is still to seek. The solution which I have to offer has

at least the merit of simplicity. I would refer the name יהוה to the same class with יעקב and יוסף , with ישראל and ישמעאל , with זרעאל and יבנאל . All these names are primarily *formulae of invocation*, by means of which a community, whether tribe or city, was placed beneath the protection, the patronage, or advocacy, of the deity whose name was thus "called upon it" (Deut. xxviii. 10, et saepe). The practice may be exactly illustrated by the analogy of a mediaeval example, which I cite from the *Monasticon Anglicanum*, vol. I (Lond., fol., 1655), p. 890, col. 2 :—

Ranulfus Comes Cestriae fundavit Abbatiam de DEULACRES, & cum poneret primum lapidem fundamenti ejusdem ecclesiae, dixit in Gallicis verbis Deux encres, & alii circumstantes responderunt Amen ; & Comes, hoc (inquit) Monasterium vocatur DEULACRES, ut nomen Domini super illud invocetur.

Who can doubt that if the Earl of Chester had been a Syrian chief in the age of the Pharaohs, he would, with the same motive, have bestowed upon the sanctuary which he established the name of יוסף אל ?

A modern town is the result of a natural growth, in a spot favoured by the conditions of peaceful industry and undisturbed commerce, which the progress of civilization has established over wide areas. In the ancient world, upon the other hand, the foundation of a city was in many, probably in most cases, a definite historical event, involving the selection and fortification of a site, the establishment of a political or municipal society, the dedication of a sanctuary, and the performance of a religious ceremonial (vid. Fustel de Coulanges, *La Cité Antique*, livre III, chap. iv). "On fondait une ville d'un seul coup, tout entière en un jour. . . . Aussi la fondation d'une ville était-elle toujours un acte religieux" (ibid.). In the names זרעאל and יבנאל we have the memorial of such an act. The prophecy of Hosea (ii. 23) shows us how fully the significance of the former was borne in mind. That of the latter speaks for itself.

It is probably inaccurate and misleading to describe such

terms as "place-names." A city is a place, and something more. It is the seat of a community. What were the elements of such a community we may learn from Joshua viii. 1 b: "I have given into thy hand the *king* of Ai, and his *people*, and his *city*, and his *land*." There was then the people; the territory which supported it; the walled town which furnished it with a refuge, a sanctuary, a market, and a judgment seat; the king who governed it in peace, and led it against its enemies; and, we must add, the god, upon whose protection all depended, and who was invoked by the formula which on the one hand would readily pass in usage into an appellation distinguishing the god himself in his character of tutelary deity, while on the other it would become at once the motto and the name of the city thus entrusted to his care.

In the case of the tribal names *ישראל* and *ישמעאל*, it is a very probable hypothesis that these modes of invocation were first adopted as war-cries, analogous to the mottoes of mediaeval heraldry. Robertson-Smith (*Kinship*, pp. 38, 39) describes the Arabic *hayy* as usually meaning "such a kindred group as was guided in war and on the march by one chief, migrating together, and forming generally a single settlement, which might, however, consist of several *dárs* or groups of tents at some distance from one another. As the *hayy* had its own chief, so also it had its own war-cry—*usually the tribal name, or that of its god*—and its own flag." (The italics are mine. Cf. *ibid.*, note, pp. 257, 258.) Mr. G. Buchanan Gray makes the same suggestion, *Hebrew Pr. Names*, p. 218.

From Robertson-Smith's note (*op. cit.*, p. 257) it would appear that the war-cry might be changed upon occasion. And in the Book of Genesis (xxxii. 29) we are given to understand that *ישראל* was in fact a substitute for *יעקב*. If this be so, a new form of invocation, and consequently a new name, might be adopted by a tribe at any period of its history, and we are no longer compelled to refer the origin of the tribal name to that of the tribe itself. It is

however to be remembered, that under certain circumstances a new tribe might be formed by the alliance of elements (often cognate) which had a previously independent existence. Such an event might well be marked by the deliberate adoption of a new form of invocation, common to both parties, which would soon become the title of the whole community. For instance, supposing for the sake of argument that the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh had at any time a separate existence and were subsequently united to form a single whole, they might well have adopted as a common symbol the motto $\text{אל יוסף} = \text{Deux encres}$. "The history of every nation," writes Mommsen (*Hist. Rome*, book I, chap. vi), "is a *synoikismos* on a great scale." Of such a *synoikismos* between the tribes which used the invocation אל יעקב and those which employed the formula אל יוסף , following, probably as a consequence, upon the entry of both parties into relations of dependence upon Egypt, we have, if I mistake not, a hint in Gen. xlviii. 5. The source is late, but the incident in accordance with probability. It may even have been upon this occasion that the formula אל ישראל was substituted for that of יעקב .

We should be justified in inferring from analogy that the names יעקב and יוסף implied the subject אל . But direct evidence is supplied by the occurrence of the names in their full form upon the lists of Thothmes III and upon other ancient monuments. The omission of the divine subject may also be illustrated from the practice of ancient Egypt. In royal names, "sometimes the sentence is shortened, and the name of the god is understood: as for instance, 'Usirkaf, His double is omnipotent;' 'Snofrûi, He has made me good;' 'Khûfûi, He has protected me,' are put for the names Usirkeri, Ptahsnofrui, Khnûmkhûfûi, with the suppression of Râ, Phtah, and Khnûmû" (Maspero, *Dawn of Civ.*, p. 260). In the Hebrew examples under discussion a motive for the suppression is not far to seek. Besides the desire for brevity, which counts for something in a war-cry, as well as in a name in common use, the

invocation of the tribal god was not lightly to be taken on the lips (cf. Ex. xx. 7).

All these names, in the first instance modes of invocation of the god of tribe or city, may not only pass in usage into appellations either of the god or of his people, but from the latter signification they may again be transferred either to the land inhabited by a given community, or to individual members of that community, especially in foreign countries. Their transference to an eponymous ancestor is a genealogical fiction, and I find no evidence to show that the eponymous ancestor was ever confounded with the tribal god. The inference which I should draw from the narrative that ascribes the foundation of Beth-el to the patriarch יעקב (Gen. xxviii. 10-22 JE) is that Beth-el was an ancient sanctuary of the tribe of which he is the representative, and, presumably therefore, a sanctuary of the tribal deity invoked by the formula יעקב אל.

It remains to discuss the exact meaning of these formulae. Mr. G. Buchanan Gray has proved, if proof were needed, that they were originally tribal or urban, but not personal names. And he has added the valuable suggestion that the verb is voluntative (*Heb. Pr. Names*, p. 218), and that we should interpret "as follows:—יִסְפָּאֵל = Let El increase; יִשְׂרָאֵל = Let El strive; יִבְנֵאֵל = Let El build (the city); יִרְעֵאֵל = Let El sow," &c. This is in strict agreement with the nature of an invocation, whether made in battle or at the solemn foundation of a city, and with the analogy of mediaeval mottoes. But it is possible and even probable that in many instances the verb is a simple imperfect, to be understood in an indicative sense. In either case it may be taken to express, not merely a wish or even a supplication, much less an abstract proposition, but an earnest desire or a confident faith, the utterance of which constitutes an omen or a prophecy, and like a blessing or a curse, is designed to bring about its own fulfilment.

I would then interpret the six names which I have chosen for discussion:—

יִעֲקֹבָל = May God supplant, or God shall supplant *our enemies*.

יִשְׂרָאֵל = May God strive, or God shall strive *for us*. Cf. יִרְבֹּעַם, יִרְבֵּעַל.

יִשְׁמָעָל = God hear *us*! or God will hear *us*.

These three names may well be war-cries.

יִזְכָּאֵל = God increase *us*!

יִזְרַעָל = God sow, or God shall sow *the land*.

יִבְנָאֵל = God build *the city*! Cf. Ps. cxxvii. 1.

It will be observed that all these sentences agree in one striking characteristic, their elliptical construction. The predication is always incomplete, and the direct or indirect object left to be inferred, or implied by the particular occasion upon which the formula of invocation is brought into use. In this respect they again resemble our mottoes of the Middle Ages. When the audience of Peter the Hermit raised the cry *God wills it!* the bystander needed not to be told what it was that God willed. It was *the cause in hand*, the resolution taken. So when William of Orange sailed for the shores of England, he placed upon his banner, beneath the elliptical motto of his house, *Je maintiendrai*, the noble words "the Liberties of England and the Protestant Religion." And in this connexion I may be permitted to cite the motto of my own family, *Sans Dieu je ne puis*, which my grandfather used to render, "Without God *I can't get over the wall*." In all these cases the incomplete predication meets the need for flexibility of application, no less than the need for brevity. If, therefore, we can discover the appropriate complement, the incomplete predication of the name יְיָ ought no longer to cause us any difficulty. It is precisely what was to be expected.

Before attempting to assign a complete interpretation of the Divine Name, it will be well to recall briefly the circumstances of the Exodus. It is not necessary for the purpose of this essay to enter into the difficult questions

connected with the chronology of this event. Some day we may possess fuller knowledge. At present any attempt to reconstruct the primitive history of Israel must be largely speculative. I shall assume that in the age of Thothmes III there existed in Syria pastoral tribes of Hebrew race, invoking the tribal deity under the respective appellations of *אל יעקב* and *אל יוסף*. When the power of Egypt was extended over the territories in which they fed their flocks, the tribe of Joseph migrated, or was deported, to the borders of Egypt, and was subsequently joined, perhaps under the stress of famine, by the more important tribe of Jacob. This circumstance led to a *synoikismos*, which may have found expression in the tribal invocation *אל ישראל*. At a later period, clientship was exchanged for servitude. Subsequently the oppressed people found a leader in a prophet of the national deity. In order to effect his purpose, it was necessary to signalize the message entrusted to him, to unite and stimulate the sufferers whom he addressed, by the proclamation of a new *symbolum fidei*, a new appellation of the God of Israel, a new promise of his presence amid their hosts. For this purpose Moses devised or adopted the name *יהוה*. (Cf. Gray, *Heb. Pr. Names*, pp. 257, 258.)

This, as I understand it, is a Qal imperfect, signifying simply, *He will be* —. The subject can be nothing else but *אל*. The narrative in Exod. iii offers a predicate of the widest possible extension. The verb, placed in the mouth of the deity, is of necessity transposed into the first person, and interpreted in the sense, *I will be what I will be*, which is further elucidated by the analogous revelation in chap. xxxiii. 19, and may not unfitly be compared with the beautiful language of the mediaeval hymn:—

Quam bonus Te querentibus
Sed quid invenientibus?

None, that is, can tell *what* God “will be” to them that love him. But it will probably be felt that the original

predicate of יהוה אל must have been something simpler and more concrete. I would suggest that the original and proper predicate is simply עמנו or אתנו, and the meaning of the Tetragrammaton,

GOD WILL BE WITH US.

We have it in this sense, transposed into the first person and addressed to the prophet himself, as constituting at once the justification of his mission and the assurance of its success, in Exod. iii. 12 : ויאמר כי אהיה עמך "Certainly I will be with thee." And further on in the same narrative, in the same general sense, but with a still more precise definition, iv. 12 : ואנכי אהיה עם פוך ; and in ver. 15, with reference to both Moses and Aaron, ואנכי אהיה עם פוך ועם פיהו. I submit that we ought to interpret these phrases in connexion with the use of אהיה in iii. 14.

With reference to the people, it occurs in a striking passage, Num. xiv. 9 : "Only rebel not against Jahveh, neither fear ye the people of the land, for they are bread for us : " סר צלם מעליהם ויהוה אתנו "Their shadow," that is to say, *their god* (perhaps we should read צלמם, but אלהיהם is certainly intended, as the verb implies a reality ; cf. Deut. xxxii. 31) "hath departed from them, but *He will be with us*." And in ver. 43 of the same chapter, על כן שבחם מאחרי יהוה ולא יהיה יהוה עמכם "Because ye are turned back from following 'He will be,' therefore 'He will be' will not be with you." We are justified in connecting both passages with those in Exod. iii, and the first may be further illustrated by comparison with Deut. xxxii. 12, "*Jahveh alone did lead him, And there was no strange god with him.*" Compare also Deut. xxix. 16, "ye have seen their abominations, and their idols, wood and stone, silver and gold, which were among them"—עמיהם. On the other hand, Deut. ii. 7, זֶה אֲרֻבְעִים שָׁנָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ עִמָּךְ, and so in chap. xx. 1, "When thou goest forth to battle against thine enemies, and seest horses, and chariots, [and] a people more

than thou, thou shalt not be afraid of them:” כי יהוה אלהיך. עמך המעלך מארץ מצרים. And again in xxxi. 8, in the exhortation to Joshua, “Jahveh, he it is that doth go before thee;” הוא יהוה עמך. So in ver. 23, “Be strong and of a good courage: for thou shalt bring the children of Israel into the land which I sware unto them;” ואנכי אהיה עמך. And in Joshua i. 5, “as I was with Moses, so אהיה עמך;” ver. 9, עמך יהוה אלהיך בכל אשר תלך; ver. 17, “According as we hearkened unto Moses in all things, so will we hearken unto thee;” רק יהיה יהוה אלהיך עמך כאשר היה עם משה; iii. 7, “that they may know that as I was with Moses, so אהיה עמך;” and finally, vii. 12, לא אוסיף להיות עמכם וגו’. Unless we suppose that the writers of all these passages, cited from JE and D, were either unacquainted with, or did not accept, the equivalence of יהוה with אהיה laid down by E in Exod. iii. 14, 15, we have no alternative but to admit that they interpreted or applied it in the sense, אהיה עמכם = יהוה עמנו. Thus taken, יהוה might fairly be said to furnish the motto of the Exodus and Conquest of Canaan. It is not, I think, an improbable supposition that it formed the actual war-cry of the armies of Israel.

Owing to the extreme generality of the substantive verb, other verbs may be substituted for it without any change of meaning, except a closer definition of the predicate. So in Exod. xxxiii. 16, “For wherein now shall it be known that I have found grace in thy sight, I and thy people? is it not in that thou goest with us?” בלכתך עמנו. Or in Deut. xx. 4, ההלך עמכם להלחם לכם עם איביכם להושיע אתכם, an instructive passage; cf. xxxi. 6. We may even compare such expressions as to make a covenant “with us,” אתנו, or to speak “with you,” עמכם, Deut. v. 3, 4, cf. ix. 9, xxix. 11, 24. In all these cases, as in Deut. xxix. 16, xxxii. 12, the preposition expresses the relation of the god to his people.

But the strongest presumption in favour of the view here put forward is to be found in the clear light which it throws upon Isaiah’s mysterious name, עמנואל. The

prophet who gave to two of his own children the significant names *שאר ישוב* and *חש בן* desired to bestow upon another and yet unborn babe, perhaps of royal race, a title which should express the promise contained by implication in the divine name *יהוה*. The child could not of course bear the actual name of the deity. Isaiah, therefore, by combining in a nominal sentence the implied subject and predicate of the Tetragrammaton, devised a name which is in meaning the exact equivalent of the title of the God of Israel. Certainly it was so understood by the writer of Isa. viii. 23-ix. 6 (especially ix. 5 b), xi. 9, xii. 2-4, who drew the inference that the child should be filled in the fullest measure with the spirit of Jahveh, and should manifest upon earth the principles of his divine rule. In this conception lay the germ of the Christian religion.

The law of flexibility of application involves the admission of alternative predicates, and the *idem per idem* interpretation given in Exod. iii. 14 is much as if we should say, "*Dieu veut ce qu'il veut*," or "*Je maintiendrai ce que je maintiendrai*," the complement being that which the occasion requires, or which the character and relations of the agent suggest. Of these secondary predicates the most important is that which recurs continually throughout Deuteronomy, notably in xxviii. 58 b, *ליראה את השם הנכבד*, והנורא הוה את יהוה אלהיך, where it is clear that *אלהיך* is regarded as an integral part of the name in question. The prophets of the following age, in like manner, expressed their religious ideal in words which echo through their writings, and summarize their teaching: "They shall be my people, and I will be their God." Thus in Jer. vii. 22, 23, "For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices: but this thing I commanded them, saying, Harken unto my voice," והייתי לכם לאלהים ואתם תהיו לי לעם. So xi. 3, 4, "The words of this covenant which I commanded your fathers in the day that I brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, out of

the iron furnace, saying, Obey my voice, and do them, according to all which I command you: "והייתם לי לעם ואנכי יהיה לכם לאלהים. And in xxiv. 7, "And I will give them an heart to know me," כי אני יהיה והיו לי לעם ואנכי אהיה להם לאלהים. Also in the passages which I have attributed to the Second Jeremiah (*J. Q. R.*, VI, 288 et seq.), xxxi. 1, 33, xxxii. 38, and the parallels in Ezek. xi. 20, xxxiv. 24 והיה משכני 27, xxxvi. 28, xxxvii. 23, 27 ואני יהוה אהיה להם לאלהים, עליהם והייתי להם לאלהים והמה יהיו לי לעם, Zech. viii. 8. If I treat this as a secondary predicate, it is because it appears to me to belong, not of necessity but in actual usage, to the higher development rather than the primitive origins of religion.

In Hosea i. 9, the text is suspicious. It is not likely that לאלהים has fallen out, and a noun seems required with the suffix to balance עמי. It is possible that we should read כי אתם לא עמי ואנכי לא אהיה בעלכם. Cf. ii. 18, vii. 16 (for לא עמי read לעמי), and xi. 7 (for לא עמי read לעמי) Cheyne, after Nowack and Ruben, *Expositor*, Nov. 1897, p. 363.

In the narrative of Jacob's dream at Beth-el (Gen. xxviii. 13-16, J) we have first the revelation of Jahveh by that name, ver. 13 ואני יחזה, and then in ver. 15 the assurance אנכי עמך. In the subsequent vow, vers. 20, 22, we find a striking combination: ver. 20 (E) "If God *will be with me*" אם יהיה אלהים עמנו, ver. 21 (R J E) "then 'He will be' shall be to me for a god" והיה י' לי לאלהים. All three sources are in harmony with the view here advocated.

A parallel to this narrative occurs in the Book of Hosea (xii. 4-6) in a passage which seems to interrupt the context, and which it is as difficult to reconcile with this prophet's polemic against the corruptions of Beth-el, as if we should find some seventeenth-century Puritan interrupting his denunciations of Laud to glorify the religious associations of Canterbury. It reads like a poetical citation, taken perhaps from some early psalm chanted at Beth-el, or sung by pilgrims on their way to inquire at that famous sanctuary.

ובאונו שרה את אלהים	בבטן עקב את אחיו
בכה ויתחנן לו	וישר אל מלאך ויכל
ושם ידבר עמנו	בית אל ימצאנו
יהוה זכרו	ויהוה אלהי הצבאות

When this was written, if I mistake not, the temple and oracle of Beth-el still flourished. "One findeth him at Beth-el, and there he speaketh with us" (M.T. The reading of the versions, "with him," looks very like a plausible correction). But the ancient formulae of *יִשְׂרָאֵל* and *יַעֲקֹבֵאל*, by which the deity had once been invoked, had lost their original meaning, and, though still interpreted by reference to their respective roots, were now applied to the legendary patriarch, and myths devised to account for their origin. They had been superseded by the *זָכַר*, *יְהוָה*, here associated with the phrase *יְדַבֵּר עִמָּנוּ*, to be compared with *עִמָּכֶם* in Deut. v. 4, already cited as in some degree analogous to *יְהוָה עִמָּנוּ*.

It will probably be felt that if the invocation of the deity by definite forms such as *יִשְׂרָאֵל* or *יְהוָה* was ever, as I have supposed, a matter of customary usage to which a religious efficacy was ascribed, some term for this class of appellations should be found in Hebrew literature. I think there is such a term, and I find it in *זָכַר*. The rendering "memorial" seems unsatisfactory, not to say unmeaning. In Exod. iii. 15, Isa. xxvi. 8, Ps. cxxxv. 13, the word is parallel to *שָׁם*. Schwally even derives *זָכַר* "male" from *זָכַר* = "*call upon in worship*" (*Oxf. Lex.*, s.v.). The Hiph'il of this verb is often used in the sense "to call upon, or invoke," e.g. Exod. xx. 24, if we read with the Syr. (Addis, in loc.) "Where thou shalt cause my name to be remembered," i.e. invoke it, for that is what was done at an altar (cp. Gen. xii. 8 b, xiii. 4); Exod. xxiii. 13, "Ye shall not invoke the name of other gods;" the *name* is in fact a *call*, "for name him, and he's always near;"—and a series of passages in II Isaiah, which will repay more particular examination:

Isa. xxvi. 13, יהוה אלהינו בעלונו אדנים וולתך לבר בכ נזכיר שמך,
and xlvi. 1, 2,

הנקראים בשם ישראל	שמעו זאת בית יעקב
הנשבעים בשם יהוה	וממי יהודה יצאו
לא באמת ולא בצדקה	ובאלהי ישראל יזכירו
ועל אלהי ישראל נסמכו	כי מעיר הקדש נקראו
	יהוה צבאות שמו

also xlix. 1 b, יהוה מבטן קראני ממעי אמי הזכיר שמי, and perhaps
lxii. 6, יהוה, המזכירים את יהוה (so *Oxf. Lex.*).

With these passages may be compared Isa. xlv. 5,

זה יאמר ליהוה אני	וזה יקרא בשם יעקב
וזה יכתב ידו ליהוה	ובשם ישראל יכנה

In lxii. 6 it must be admitted that the rendering of the R. V., "Ye that are the Lord's remembrancers," is more forcible and picturesque than that of the Lexicon = *call upon*. But in xlix. 1, where הזכיר שמי is parallel with קראני, there is a plain reference to the prophet's pre-natal "call," the "vocation" which constituted his destiny; "made mention of my name" is inadequate. In xxvi. 13 לבר בכ שמך, when compared with xlvi. 1 ובאלהי ישראל יזכירו, may fairly be rendered, "Upon thee only will we call *by thy name*," שמך being in fact a cognate accusative, as if the writer had said זכרך. The equivalence of זכר and שם is confirmed by comparing Hos. xii. 6, sup. cit., with Isa. xlvi. 2 b. Cf. Josh. xxiii. 7, Hos. ii. 19.

The reader of Isa. xlv. 5 and xlvi. 1, 2 cannot but be struck by the manner in which the use of the name of Jacob, and the name of Israel, is placed upon the same level with that of the divine name יהוה. In the second clause of xlv. 5, if we accept the traditional pointing, we are bound to render, "and another shall call upon the name of Jacob." And in the fourth clause the active significance of יכנה is confirmed by its employment in xlv. 4, ואקרא לך. בשמך אכנה ולא ידעתי. It may then be a fair question whether we should not interpret בשם ישראל הנקראים, in Isa. xlvi. 1, in strict conformity with הנשבעים בשם יהוה, in the fourth

clause of the same verse, and draw the inference that even in the age of Cyrus some relics of the original usage of (אל) and יִשְׂרָאֵל as invocations of the deity may have lingered among the people. If this should appear inconsistent with what has been said above upon Hos. xii. 4-6, it should be remembered that we have no right to assume in the religious history of Israel an uniform evolution of faith and practice.

In a previous quotation from Robertson-Smith, it was mentioned that "As the *havy* had its own chief, so also it had its own war-cry—usually the tribal name, or that of its god—and its own flag." If we accept the view that Moses furnished the Israelites with the זכר or invocation יהוה = "God will be with us," and that this was probably employed by them in battle, it may still be asked, What was their banner? What object was there, if any, to which, for instance, the name יהוה נכִי, "He will be my standard," might be applied? There was such an object. It was the Brazen Serpent. If we admit that the god of whom Moses was the prophet was in his primitive aspect a tree-spirit, one that dwelt in a bush (Deut. xxxiii. 16); that the Israelites at this period of their history may not improbably, like the Arabs of a later age under somewhat similar conditions, have regarded the serpent as the visible embodiment of the spirit of the tree; that Moses, according to ancient tradition, did actually make a serpent of brass, and elevate it upon a standard; that this symbol was subsequently carried into Canaan, and there worshipped until the time of Hezekiah: I think we shall be justified in inferring that it was the actual standard of Israel, the token of the presence of Jahveh¹. By a very curious coincidence it was adopted in Christian art as a type of Christ upon the Cross (John iii. 14). Cf. Bede, *Vita Abbatum*, § 9, of Benedict Biscop's decorations in the

¹ So, in the Assyrian campaigns, the god Asshur was represented by the two royal standards, which received worship night and morning. Maspero, II, 634.

church and monastery of Jarrow: "Item, serpenti in eremo a Moyse exaltato, Filium Hominis in cruce exaltatum comparavit." Perhaps there is a deeper and more real analogy than the Venerable Bede discerned. Both alike are symbols; but the difference between them affords a measure of the advance of Christianity beyond the level of primitive culture.

NOTE A. THE SONS OF NOAH.

WAS יהיה ever employed as a tribal name? It occurs to me as possible that in Gen. ix. 20-27 (J¹) "Shem" may be used as an enigmatic expression for Jahveh, and it certainly designates his people (ver. 26), i. e. Israel, the older Jacob. In like manner Japheth (יפת אלהים ליפת, ver. 27) may be taken as equivalent in meaning to Joseph. These two are the conquerors of Canaan, who is nevertheless represented as their brother, and as subjugated but not exterminated. The *synoikismos* of Jacob and Joseph is expressed literally in the second clause of ver. 27, וישכן באהלי שם. The three brethren are the settlers or occupants of the land, and are therefore represented as the children of "Rest." Cf. Deut. iii. 20, יניח, and the passages there cited by Driver from D², all describing a peaceful settlement, the result of conquest. With "Rest" begins the culture of the soil, and particularly that of the vine. Yet Noah, Shem, and Japheth still dwell in tents (vers. 21, 27). Clearly the narrative relates to the epoch of transition from the pastoral to the agricultural stage of Israel's history, which followed upon the conquest of Canaan. There is perhaps a reference to the immoralities of Canaanitish nature-worship. Cf. Amos ii. 7, 8. The point of view of the legend is of course to be distinguished from that of the genealogy.

NOTE B. יהוה צבאות.

THE view here taken of the divine name יהוה affords a very simple explanation of the title יהוה צבאות, which will then be interpreted יהוה אל הצ' עמנו = "The God of Hosts will be with

us." Cf. Hos. xii. 6 ; Isa. xlvi. 26 ; Ps. xlvi. 8, 12. The hosts of heaven, which form the court and council of Jahveh (1 Kings xxii. 19), are thus invoked to fight on behalf of the armies of Israel, just as they do in Jud. v. 20. Cf. Deut. xx. 4 ; 1 Sam. xvii. 45. It is possible that this appellation may have succeeded an earlier form **ישראל הצבאות** or **לנו יעקב אל הצבאות איבינו**. Even **בעל הצבאות** is a possible subject for יהוה. Cf. **ירבעל**. A trace of the original use of **יעקב** as a **זכר** may perhaps be found in Ps. xxiv. 6, and the meaning of **יצחק** may be understood from Ps. ii. 4 (**ישחק**) and lix. 9 (**חשחק**).

Sometimes, after long preoccupation with the remote past, the mists which obscure the mirror of history seem to disperse, and the distant scene becomes visible. We witness the night attack, such as that led by Gideon ; we see the chieftain rushing forward, pointing with his drawn sword to the starry sky above, as he cheers on his followers with the cry **יהוה אל הצבאות עמנו**. And the host of Israel echoes back יהוה. Then the clouds gather, and all again is silent.

GREY HUBERT SKIPWITH.